

the counselor of the State Department, and Deputy Treasury Secretary Robert Kimmitt met with Annan and his deputy, Mark Malloch Brown, at the secretary general's Sutton Place residence. There was no one else present.

The two presidential envoys asked Annan to use his unique "convening powers" to help organize international meetings that would lead (by this fall, the Americans hope) to the unveiling of a new "Iraq Compact"—an agreement between the Iraqi government and major international donors that would commit Baghdad to a series of political and economic reforms in return for substantially more international aid. (Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki called Annan the same day to make an identical request.)

This is a good idea—and quite similar to suggestions from many administration critics. With the battle for Baghdad raging, it remains to be seen whether an Iraq Compact will work—or even get off the ground—but it is certainly an important step in the right direction for Iraq and for American policy.

For Annan and the United Nations, Bush's request poses an ironic and difficult challenge. On the one hand, the administration is asking for help on the worst problem it faces, acknowledging, however belatedly and reluctantly, that once again, the United Nations is not only relevant but at times indispensable to the United States. On the other hand, the resentment among the majority of U.N. member states over the way the institution has been treated recently, especially by Washington's current U.N. ambassador, makes any effort to get the United Nations to help the United States far more difficult.

How to treat the United Nations has been a particular dilemma for President Bush, since opponents of the organization form an important part of the administration's core constituency. Internal disagreements over the past five years about whether to support it or abandon it, to use it or bypass it, have both weakened the organization and led to reduced U.S. influence even as more and more intractable issues are thrown into its hands.

The United Nations is facing major budgetary problems caused primarily by American insistence on a six-month budget cycle instead of the normal two-year cycle. It must deal with growing shortfalls in the U.S. contribution to peacekeeping funding, despite Washington's calls for more peacekeepers in Darfur and elsewhere. And it is confronted by a deadlock over rebuilding the headquarters complex in New York—a deadlock whose main cause is the administration's failure to push Congress for proper funding. (This is particularly difficult to understand, since the U.N. signature building, its 38-story East River office tower—built in 1950 and never subject to modern safety codes—is widely acknowledged to be the major building in New York most vulnerable to a terrorist attack. For example, when the president visits it, the Secret Service closes down FDR Drive beneath it—but what about the rest of the time?)

Still, even though Annan and the world body have been diminished by Washington, he and his colleagues simply cannot refuse to help on the Iraq matter; it is their responsibility as international civil servants to go where the problems are worst and then to do their best. And, on the basis of private talks with Annan, Malloch Brown and administration officials, I have no doubt that they intend to do just that. In fact, Malloch Brown has already agreed to travel to Baghdad very soon for preliminary meetings that the United Nations and the United States hope will culminate later this year in a high-level conference in the region. As Annan moves into his last six months as secretary general,

this would be the right way to end a turbulent decade in that office—with a genuine contribution to the cause of peace in Iraq.

It is, however, impossible not to note the irony and the implications of what has happened in the past two weeks between Washington and the United Nations. Once again, an administration that has underfunded, undersupported and undermined the United Nations has turned to it, almost in desperation, for help.

The lesson should be clear: Despite the enormously self-destructive actions of many other member states, especially the group of developing nations called the G-77, the United Nations still serves U.S. foreign policy interests in many important ways. Not only Iraq but also Iran, Darfur, Afghanistan and the difficult negotiations just started over Kosovo's final status—all issues of vital importance to the United States—have now ended up in the United Nations. To weaken this institution further, as has happened in recent years, serves no clear American national security interest. To strengthen it would make it more valuable to the United States and to every nation that seeks conflict resolution, stability and economic progress. With the maneuvering over the selection of Annan's successor underway, it is time for Washington—and this must include Congress—to put behind it a sorry period of confusion and offer the United Nations more support, both financial and political, in return for the things it needs in Iraq and elsewhere.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CATHY McMORRIS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2006

Miss McMORRIS. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances beyond my control, I was unable to make votes Monday because of unexpected plane difficulties en route to Washington, DC. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both H.R. 5061 as well as H.R. 2563.

A NEW KIND OF LAW IN A NEW KIND OF WAR

HON. ROB SIMMONS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2006

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit for the RECORD a column that appeared in The New London Day on July 9. It was written by Glenn Sulmasy, an associate professor of law at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and a noted expert on national security law. The title of the op-ed piece is "A New Kind of Law in a New Kind of War."

America is not at war with a traditional enemy, but a network of civilians who swear allegiance to radical Islam. Consequently, the various laws that have historically governed international conflicts do not seem to fit well with our current situation. Nevertheless, we have spent a lot of time discussing the present and future conditions of the combatants in our custody. In his column, Glenn Sulmasy offers a series of recommendations providing a framework for this important debate. He makes an especially compelling case for a National Security Court system.

America's critics do little more than attack the current system. While such criticism is important, it is not always constructive. We need to think of new ways to handle the detention and adjudication of enemy combatants.

In the book *In Time of War*, which details President Roosevelt's treatment of eight Nazi saboteurs in 1942, Pierce O'Donnell argues that our enemies "would forcibly impose their nihilistic, totalitarian ideology on society through violence and intimidation. That is precisely why this just struggle—characterized as a war on terror—should not be tainted by compromising our historic respect for justice, constitutional liberties and international law."

As we take steps to defend America from a terrorist threat, we cannot lose sight of the values we are defending. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to take a few minutes and read Glenn Sulmasy's column, which outlines a new kind of law for a new kind of war.

[From the New London Day, July 9, 2006]

GUANTANAMO BAY: NEW KIND OF LAW FOR
NEW KIND OF WAR

(By Glenn Sulmasy)

Last week, in *Rumsfeld vs. Hamdan*, the Supreme Court decided that the military commissions for the jihadist detainees in Guantanamo Bay are not lawfully constructed. I disagree. However the realities of maintaining international support and ensuring domestic consensus on fighting the global war demands we look for alternatives for detaining and trying jihadists. Regardless of how the Court decided in *Hamdan*, the commissions have failed.

The Court has forced the opponents of military commissions to offer legitimate solutions. The best solution available is the creation of a National Security Court system.

The global war on terror has created ambiguities in both the laws of armed conflict and how best to fight this new war. The asymmetric threat of international terror, the lack of a clear national enemy, the problems with the military commissions in Guantanamo Bay, allegations of torture and the recent constitutional issues surrounding wiretap efforts of the National Security Agency all highlight the lack of an appropriate body of law to govern this new conflict. Nowhere is this ambiguity more evident than in the United States' handling of detainees.

The "enemies" in this war are men and women who fight not for a nation but for ideology, do not wear standard military uniforms and, as doctrine, flout the laws of war. These new "warriors" have created extreme difficulties since they are not conventional prisoners of war (regardless what the recent ruling has asserted) and thus (with all due respect to Justice John Paul Stevens) the Geneva Conventions simply do not apply to them. Adjudicating their status and crimes has become increasingly chaotic. It initially appeared that the military tribunals (currently referred to as military commissions by the Bush Administration) would provide the appropriate venue for handling the prosecution of the detainees. But now, over four years later, there has not been a completed prosecution. More than 500 detainees remain in Guantanamo Bay and supposedly another 450 are being held in Afghanistan.

As this problem grows, the U.S. needs a new approach. Our own federal courts system, the standard courts-martial system and other traditional methods, won't work. A healthy, bipartisan debate on "what" to do next is critical. This is a new war, one that mixes law enforcement and warfare, and does not fit neatly in either category.

A national security court apparatus needs to be legislated. As Congress begins to debate (as ordered by the Supreme Court) how to handle jihadists' violations of the laws of war, policymakers must achieve both the reality and appearance of justice.

Clearly, many issues need to be hammered out regarding the composition of the court.

The court would be a hybrid of the military commissions and our own federal trial system.

The jihadist would be afforded limited rights, including right to counsel and be detained and tried on military bases within the United States. The law would allow the death penalty. The hearings would be closed with the exception of observers from Human Rights Organizations (for example, Amnesty International, the International Red Cross and the U.N. Human Rights Watch.) The U.S. Department of Justice would provide prosecutors and administer over the program.

International concern over Guantanamo is detracting from our ability to provide guidance, counsel and policy in this and other arenas. A blue-ribbon commission, created by the president with bipartisan support from Congress, should immediately be formed to address questions as to proper detention, adjudication, intelligence gathering, terrorist surveillance and other legal issues associated with the threat of international terror.

The National Security Court, a natural outgrowth of the military commissions, affords an opportunity for U.S. policy makers to respond forcefully and effectively to calls for a way out of the Guantanamo issue.

The Hamdan decision has pushed us in this direction. The military commissions are no longer a viable option.

Rather than offering no solutions and merely attacking the existing structure, policy makers need to emerge with fresh ways to look at the proper detention and adjudication of the jihadists.

It is time to regain the initiative, and reaffirm our leadership in the humane prosecution of those who would undermine the ideals of democracy.

A GASTRONOMIC ADVENTURE IN HARLEM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an article titled *Moving On Up: In Harlem, A Renaissance in Food* by Cynthia Kilian into the RECORD. The article, published in the June 28, 2006 edition of the New York Post, celebrates the variety of restaurants and dining experiences available in Harlem.

Harlem is one of the foci of diversity in New York City. One only has to walk down the streets of Harlem to see this celebration of diversity. Nowhere else it is more evident than in the dining scene of Harlem.

Dinosaur Barbeque, the ribs joint on 131st St., West Harlem has been a big hit from the moment it opened on December 1, 2004. If we walk down a little farther, we arrive at Pier 2110 Seafood Restaurant, the new seafood place with a raw bar and lounge with ginseng drinks, that just opened next to the Harlem Lanes bowling alley. A little to the east on 121st St. and Frederick Douglass Boulevard lies Harlem Vintage, the sleek wine shop on 2235 Frederick Douglass Blvd., where a \$10 bottle of sauvignon blanc is as easy to come

by as a \$90 bottle of Brunello di Montalcino, caters to a variety of tastes.

Native at 118th St. and Lenox Ave. offers BLT salad to Moroccan fried chicken with collard greens and walnut sauce. Right around the corner is Ginger, known for its "organic" Chinese food. Harlem Tea Room, on 118th and Madison, is a perfect spot to enjoy poetry readings, music events and seminars while sipping one of their 22 kinds of tea with the eclectic menu of sandwiches and cakes. Further to the east, on 118th St. and 3rd Ave., is Creole, where alligator gumbo and crawfish etouffee is accompanied by nightly jazz from a changing roll call of artists.

The "New Harlem" with its assorted collection of bars and eateries is fast becoming the destination for the sophisticated palate and fine dining, along with maintaining the popularity of the neighborhood's stalwart Patsy's pizza, Copland's gospel brunch and Senegalese thiebou diene (fish stew).

My colleagues and I invite you to go on a gastronomic adventure in Harlem. And I am sure that I need not remind you that our immigrant communities take the credit for enriching the American culture by adding a variety of spices to the "melting pot."

MOVING ON UP: IN HARLEM, A RENAISSANCE IN FOOD

(By Cynthia Kilian)

JUNE 28, 2006.—No one can accuse 125th Street of subtlety. To walk across the Harlem thoroughfare is to submit to a barrage of music-blaring shops, barking street vendors and crowds. But head south on Frederick Douglass Boulevard, and a much different climate quickly emerges.

There's Harlem Vintage, a sleek wine shop filled with a large, of-the-moment international selection of bottles. A few more blocks down, patrons sip cocktails in the cool, woody comfort of Melba's, while just across the street, latte lovers tap on their laptops in an airy coffee-cum-eatery that—surprise—is not Starbucks.

Sure, we'd heard about Harlem's luxury condo market and coveted brownstones, and even a new crop of trendy clothing shops. But caviar bars and organic wines?

North of Central Park—and above 96th Street to the east—soul kitchens are being sidled up to by everything from organic Chinese food to moules frites that a waitress at a restaurant named Food says even Belgians seek out.

Not that the neighborhood's popular chicken and waffles and Senegalese thiebou diene (fish stew) are going anywhere. Neither are stalwarts Patsy's pizza and Copland's gospel brunch. They're just getting some company.

The latest buzz on one-two-five is Pier 2110 Seafood Restaurant, which just opened nearby last week. From the management of Manna's of Harlem and Brooklyn, it sports a snazzy lounge, raw bar and ginseng drinks.

As for ViVa—a k a Viaduct Valley—that's real-estate speak for the West Harlem area reportedly poised to spawn its own restaurant scene in the coming year near Dinosaur Bar-B-Que, Fairway Market and the new Citarella. "New Harlem" is fast becoming the next destination for fine dining.

SERVED UPTOWN

1. Food, 1569 Lexington, between 100 and 101st streets; (212) 348-0200.

The no-nonsense moniker belies the jazzed-up classics in this new incarnation of the former DinerBar, where fish-centric chef Scott Geller (who's worked at Nobu) turns out luscious escolar and moules frites in Dijon white wine broth in a friendly neighborhood spot.

2. Itzocan Bistro, 1575 Lexington Ave., at 101st Street; (212) 423-0255.

Mexican with French flourishes—such as seafood posole—has been making East Harlem residents happy at this offshoot of an East Village original.

3. Creole, 2167 Third Ave., at 118th Street; (212) 876-8838, creolenyc.com.

Creole and Cajun bites—alligator gumbo and crawfish etouffee from the kitchen—and nightly jazz from a changing roll call of artists.

4. Harlem Tea Room, 1793A Madison Ave., at 118th Street; (212) 348-3471, harlemtearoom.com.

Twenty-two kinds of tea including fruit blends and organics at this comfy spot for nibbling cakes and sandwiches or taking in poetry readings, music events and seminars.

5. Ginger, 1400 Fifth Ave., at 116th St.; (212) 423-1111, gingerexpress.com.

Healthy Chinese food? That's the word at this sleek, colorful space located in a "green" building. Organic and antibiotic-free ingredients light on the frying result in a baked egg roll (skip it) and sweet, fall-off-the-bone BBQ beef ribs.

6. Native, 101 W. 118th St., at Lenox Avenue; (212) 665-2525, harlemnative.com.

Ample outdoor seating makes this bright-colored, 5-year-old eatery a fair-weather find for eclectic fare from a BLT salad to Moroccan fried chicken with collard greens and walnut sauce.

7. Settepani, 196 Lenox Ave., at 120th Street; (917) 492-4806.

This 5-year-old offshoot of a Westchester bakery chainlet has become an epicenter for pastries, sandwiches, salads and pasta, especially when a jazz band riffs outside.

8. Emperor's Roe, 200 Lenox Ave., at 120th St.; (212) 866-3700, emperorsoe.com.

Caviar and Harlem together as never before at this mail-order shop which has just added a shiny new tasting bar and dining area for fish eggs, smoked salmon and bubbly.

9. Society Coffee & Juice, 2104 Frederick Douglass Blvd., between 113th & 114th; (212) 222-3323, societycoffee.com.

Airy, laptop-friendly lounge for java, wine, and "passion and cream" smoothies to wash down waffles, fondue and thin-crust pizza.

10. Melba's, 300 W. 114th, at Frederick Douglass Blvd.; (212) 864-7777, melbasrestaurant.com.

This welcoming, woody bistro gives comfort food a tweak by filling spring rolls with yellow rice, black-eyed peas and collards.

11. Harlem Vintage, 2235 Frederick Douglass Blvd., at 121st Street; (212) 866-9463, harlemvintage.com.

A \$10 bottle of sauvignon blanc is just as easy to come by as a \$90 Brunello di Montalcino from their "winemaker of color" selection at this chic shop.

12. Pier 2110 Seafood Restaurant, 2110 Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Blvd., between 125th and 126th streets; (212) 280-4737, pier2110.com.

This spanking-new seafood place with a raw bar and lounge just opened next to the new

HONORING TOM MACKLIN FOR HIS SERVICE AS CITY OF DELAWARE FIRE CHIEF

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2006

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join many of my constituents in Delaware, Ohio in